

REMARKS

I. Status of Application

Claims 1-6 and 8-25 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-6 and 8-23 presently stand rejected.

By the present amendment, Applicant amends claims 1 and 13.

The present Amendment addresses each point of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Formalities

The Examiner still has not indicated whether the Formal Drawings filed on February 20, 2004 are accepted. Applicant again requests that the Examiner acknowledge and approve the aforementioned Formal Drawings.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 11, 13, 15-19, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shin (US 5,078,476) in view of Beard (US 5,747,938). Claims 2 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shin and Beard in view of Kurzman (US 5,057,977). Claims 9, 10, 20, and 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shin and Beard in view of Weindorf (US 6,396,217). Claims 12 and 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shin and Beard in view of Hyman (US 5,637,093). Applicant traverses all of these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

A. Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite (among other things):

...an optical limitation means for limiting
light emitted out of a lighting means and
incident upon a screen of said display means...
wherein said lighting means is external to
said display.

However, none of the cited references, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests the above feature. In fact, both Shin and Beard are directed to fundamentally different control mechanisms than the claimed optical limitation means that is external to said display since both Shin and Beard are directed to the control of an internal backlight output so as to improve the poor viewability of an LCD screen resulting from the ambient lighting condition.

More particularly, Beard teaches that the microcontroller 16 may adjust the drive to the power supply unit 12 with a predetermined algorithm until the light output of the internal EL panel 10 is at an optimum level. Further, Shin is directed to a backlight power controller for preventing electric power from being consumed unnecessarily by turning the internal backlight off when there is no video signal input. However, neither Beard, Shin, nor any combination thereof teaches or suggest the feature of an optical limitation means for limiting light emitted out of a lighting means and incident upon a screen of said display means, wherein said lighting means is external to said display, as claimed.

Accordingly, the invention recited in claim 1 is completely different from the cited references and there would have been no reason for a skilled artisan to look toward the cited internal backlight control mechanisms to control an external light source, as claimed. Indeed, the advantages obtained by the claimed invention cannot possibly be achieved from the internal

backlight control mechanisms taught by the cited references. As discussed in the present specification, for example, external light that is incident upon a screen of a display reduces the contrast of the display in a low luminance region. Thus, for the maximum output of a backlight, the process of adjusting the optical output of the backlight to an optimum level corresponds to lowering the output. However, the lowering of the luminance of the internal backlight deteriorates the contrast of the backlight, further causing poor viewability of the display due to the incidence of the external light. Therefore, the claimed optical limitation means for limiting light emitted out of a lighting means and incident upon a screen of said display means, wherein said lighting means is external to said display cannot possibly be achieved from the cited references.

As such, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references for *at least* these reasons. Further, the dependent claims 2-6, 7-12 and 24 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

B. Independent Claim 13

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claim 13 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 demonstrate the patentability of claim 13. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Further, Applicant submits that the dependent claims 14-23 and 25 are

allowable *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claim 13. Thus, the allowance of these claims is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 26, 2007

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666